



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,629	05/13/2001	Mary Lou Floyd	308,650	5777

7590 11/15/2007
ABELMAN FRAYNE & SCHWAB
666 Third Avenue 10th Floor
New York, NY 10017-5621

EXAMINER

FADOK, MARK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/15/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/681,629

Applicant(s)

FLOYD, MARY LOU

Examiner

Mark Fadok

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

The examiner is in receipt of applicant's response to office action mailed 3/7/2007, which was received 9/6/2007. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment to claims 3, 11 and 15, leaving claims 3-18 open to prosecution. The examiner has carefully considered applicant's amendment and remarks and finds them convincing, however after further searching a new grounds of rejection necessitated by amendment follows:

Examiner's Note

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers or figures in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over realname (a collection of articles and web pages listed as realname1-8 and dated prior to May 13,2000) in view of Official Notice and further in view of US PG PUB 20020169676 and applicant's response to a prior office action received 9/6/2007.

In regards to claims 1-5,7-13 and 15-17, realname teaches all the features of the instant claims except as follows: Realname teaches inputting a user selected brand name and returning a URL that is mapped to the brand name (realname8). Realname also teaches providing from a webpage's search engine access to enhanced search results without having to enter complex URL's (realname3, page 2 and realname8, page 6), but may not specifically mention that a brand name is entered into a predetermined webpage as a portal to a predetermined website. The examiner takes official notice that providing functionality to provide a predetermined webpage as a portal to a predetermined website (as an example clicking on URLs embedded on a predetermined portal such as yahoo and/or providing a webpage such as shown on page 6 of realname8 on a portal page such as Infoseek, realname3, page 2) was old and well known in art at the time of the invention. It was well within the skill of an ordinary artizen

to at the time of the invention to program functionality such as accessing a predetermined webpage as a portal to a predetermined website into a website accessing system, and therefore obvious, since all of the elements of the cited references perform the same function when combined as they do in the prior art . Thus such a combination would have yielded predictable results (see Sakraida, 425 US at 282, 189 USPQ at 453). Since the independent claims only unite old elements with no change in there respective functions the claimed subject matter would have been obvious under KSR, 127 S. Ct at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

Also, applicant admits that the only difference between the instant invention and others at the time of invention was that the other sites provided only a finite number of products on those sites (US PG PUB 20020169676 to applicant col 14). In this regard the examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand the brand name searches of the prior art cited by applicant to include an infinite number of searchable items which applicant claims as the distinguishable feature, since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in that art . St Regis Paper co. v. Bemis Co, 193 USPQ 8.

Applicant further admits on page 12 para 3 of response to office action filed 9/6/2007 that the creation of the WebPages is routine and simple.

In regards to claims 6, 14 and 18, realname teaches inputting a brand name into a computer, but does not specifically mention that the device is an interactive television. The examiner takes official notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention to use interactive televisions for inputting search information. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in realname the use of the input functionality in interactive televisions. Because this will increase the revenue to the company by not excluding the interactive televisions from using brand names while searching the internet.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

Applicant argues that combination of the realname references is improper because they are published by different entities and on different dates. The examiner does not agree that a motivation is needed to combine the references, because each reference specifically discloses features of the realname prior art therefore motivation is not required, since it is explicitly taught that all the references are related to the same prior art system called realname. The realname references, it is believed, create recognized combinable prior art to one of ordinary skill in the art. Regardless, however, it is noted that all of the elements of the cited references perform the same function when combined as they do in the prior art. Thus such a combination would have yielded predictable results (see Sakraida, 425 US at 282, 189 USPQ at 453. Since

the independent claims only unite old elements with no change in there respective functions the claimed subject matter would have been obvious under KSR, 127 S. Ct at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396.

With regards to clams 6,1 4 and 18, a "traverse" is a denial of an opposing party's allegations of fact. The Examiner respectfully submits that applicants' arguments and comments do not appear to traverse what Examiner regards as knowledge that would have been generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Even if one were to interpret applicants' arguments and comments as constituting a traverse, applicants' arguments and comments do not appear to constitute an adequate traverse because applicant has not specifically pointed out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. 27 CFR 1.104(d)(2), MPEP 707.07(a). An adequate traverse must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying Examiner's notice of what is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 728, 169 USPQ 231, 234 (CCPA1971).

If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well known statement during examination, then the object of the well known statement is taken to be admitted prior art. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **571.272.6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

Application/Control Number:
09/681,629
Art Unit: 3625

Page 8

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Jeffrey A. Smith** can be reached on **571.272.6763**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

571-273-8300

[Official communications; including
After Final communications labeled
"Box AF"]

For general questions the receptionist can be reached at
571.272.3600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mark Fadok
Primary Examiner